

Date: Fri, 19 Aug 94 04:30:13 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #381  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                        Fri, 19 Aug 94                        Volume 94 : Issue 381

Today's Topics:  
    Code Must GO! or stay!?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

---

Date: Thu, 18 Aug 1994 14:30:08  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!  
sundog.tiac.net!news.sprintlink.net!indirect.com!s146.phxslip.indirect.com!  
lenwink@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Code Must GO! or stay!?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>Do you pay union scale for air time? What is the format of the discussion?  
NOBODY gets paid to do the show, Clay, NOT even me! The show is to  
advance the hobby/service of amateur radio, as far as I'm concerned.  
I have received many replies PRO-CODE, but I haven't even received  
one reply from a person willing to be on the show against the CODE.  
How verrrry interesting!

73, Len,  
KB7LPW

---

Date: 18 Aug 1994 21:16:28 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!  
news.tamu.edu!furuta@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <lenwink.173.0007B12B@indirect.com>, <1994Aug15.183558.1@aspen.uml.edu>, <lenwink.180.00086E40@indirect.com>ruta  
Subject : Re: Slow Code Idea by Wayne Green

In article <lenwink.180.00086E40@indirect.com>,  
Len Winkler <lenwink@indirect.com> wrote:

>And another problem that will rear it's ugly head all too soon....The 10  
>year license renewals are here now and it is expected by many that the  
>number of licensed hams will shrink from more than 635,000 to around  
>400,000 or less! That's a full 1/3 loss. If that occurs, you'll find MANY  
>cutbacks and MORE from current manufacturers, price increases, and  
>since we have even fewer names on the rolls, possibly more loss of  
>spectrum.

I don't understand why a loss of numbers on paper will affect the manufacturers' business plans. People on the rolls but not active already aren't buying equipment. They have no effect on the market.

> Plus, over 55% of the licensed hams would be no-code techs!  
>How's that for something to think about?

Is this true, or would it be more accurate to say "over 55% of the licensed hams entered the hobby as no-code techs"? My understanding was that there is a healthy upgrade rate with the new technicians.

--Rick  
KE3IV

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #381  
\*\*\*\*\*